

Egyptology and Ancient Near Eastern Studies

Reading Sumerian Poetry

JEREMY BLACK



Reading Sumerian Poetry



Athlone Publications in Egyptology and Ancient Near Eastern Studies

Series Editor: John Baines (University of Oxford)

Editorial Board: Jeremy Black (University of Oxford)
Alan Bowman (University of Oxford)
Erik Hornung (University of Basel)
Anthony Leahy (University of Birmingham)
Peter Machinist (Harvard University)
Piotr Michalowski (University of Michigan)
Daniel Potts (University of Sydney)
David O'Connor (New York University)
Dorothy Thompson (University of Cambridge)
Pascal Vernus (Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Paris)
Norman Yoffee (University of Michigan)

Forthcoming

Middle Kingdom Literature by Richard B Parkinson

0 485 93002 1 hb

The Ancient Egyptian Royal Tale by Antonio Loprieno

0 485 93004 8 hb

Religion and Society in Ancient Egypt by John Baines

0 485 93005 6 hb

Literature of New Kingdom Egypt by H W Fischer-Elfert

0 485 93006 4 hb

Myth and Politics in Ancient Near Eastern Historiography by Mario Liverani

0 485 93007 2 hb

City and Cosmos in Ancient Egypt by David O'Connor

0 485 93008 0 hb

Already Published

Mesopotamian Civilization by D T Potts

0 485 93001 3 hb

Reading Sumerian Poetry

Jeremy Black



THE ATHLONE PRESS

London

First published 1998 by
THE ATHLONE PRESS
1 Park Drive, London NW11 7SG

© Jeremy Black 1998

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
*A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library*

ISBN 0 485 93003 X

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or
by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or
otherwise, without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

Typeset by Ensystems, Saffron Walden

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Cambridge University Press

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Glossary of ancient Mesopotamian proper names</i>	xi
PART ONE	
1 Introductory	3
1.1 Reading the oldest poetry	3
1.2 Literary study of Mesopotamian literature	8
1.3 Metaphorical language	9
1.4 Wolfgang Heimpel and animal imagery	14
2 Theoretical considerations	20
2.1 General difficulties for the literary study of ancient literature	20
2.1.1 Limitations of linguistic knowledge	20
2.1.2 Problems with chronology and phonology	23
2.1.3 Absence of ancient literary theory	24
2.1.4 Lack of integrity of the text	28
2.1.5 Fragmentary state of preservation	38
2.1.6 Critical theory and missing information	42
2.1.6.1 Author-centred approaches	43
2.1.6.2 Historical context	45
2.1.6.3 Making use of theory	46
2.1.7 The subjectivity of criticism	47
3 The study of imagery	50
3.1 Definition of terms	50
3.2 Approaches to the study of imagery	51
3.2.1 Statistics	52
3.2.2 Types of imagery	55
3.2.2.1 Live and dead images	56
3.3 Some complications	57
Translation of the Sumerian poem <i>Lugalbanda</i>	58

PART TWO

4	Literary criticism in practice	67
4.1	Introduction: Sumerian imagery and the poem <i>Lugalbanda</i>	67
4.2	Study of the imagery	73
4.2. 1	Statistics	73
4.2. 2	Range of subject matter	77
4.2. 3	Images in their immediate contexts	84
4.2. 4	Image clusters	110
4.2. 5	Density of imagery	115
4.2. 6	Literary environment and intertextuality	118
	4.2.6.1 <i>Lugalbanda in the mountain cave</i>	120
4.2. 7	Formulas, commonplaces and 'worn-out' metaphors	124
	4.2.7.1 Formulaic images and expressions in parallel contexts	126
	4.2.7.2 Formulaic images and expressions in disparate contexts	132
	4.2.7.3 Parallel images with disparate expression and context	143
	4.2.7.4 Commonplaces	150
	4.2.7.5 Epithets	153
4.2. 8	Recurrent imagery	156
4.2. 9	Broad 'structural' or 'dramatic' imagery	159
4.2.10	Fantastic elements of the narrative	167
5	Conclusion	170
	Translation of <i>Lugalbanda in the mountain cave</i>	176
	<i>List of Sumerian literary compositions cited</i>	185
	<i>Bibliography</i>	188
	A. Assyriological literature	188
	B. Modern critical and other literature	196
	<i>Index</i>	201

Preface

It seems extraordinary that no book-length general survey of the world's oldest literature has yet been written. For those to whom Sumerian poetry is unknown, I hope that this work might act as a first introduction which will convey some idea of its extent, complexity and subtlety. Even so, the time is not yet ripe for a global Sumerian poetics, investigating the whole range of cross-fertilising systems that would constitute a full syntagmatic analysis of that literature; and it would be premature to attempt a wide-ranging study encompassing the totality of the subject, including the many problems centering on the reconstruction of the historical contexts in which it was created and performed. Inevitably this book touches briefly on many related matters a full treatment of each of which would easily generate as many words again.

The main aims of this study are, then, necessarily more circumscribed. Its genesis lies in the richness of the metaphorical language of the poem *Lugalbanda*, which I first became aware of when I attempted to make an English version of it in 1978. Some readers will be diligent enough to want to read straight through. It would also be possible to begin by reading the translation of *Lugalbanda* or, for those already familiar with the poem, to start by reading chapters 3 and 4, perhaps with one finger always in the translation. The translation is deliberately presented as a prose poem and not as an annotated 'text'; those who are puzzled by particular proper names may find it helpful to refer to the glossary on pp. xi–xii below. Section 4.2 is the most technical part. I have tried to write so that what I say can be understood by those who know nothing of the Sumerian language, as well as by experts in the subject. In trying to cross the bridge between literary scholarship and literary criticism one inevitably runs the risk of irritating, in different ways, those who live on either side of that bridge. What will seem banal or superficial to some may possibly seem impenetrably obscure to others. I am well aware that I may seem to be trying to solve, or wrestling with, problems which are not, or are no longer, problems for some readers. None the less I hope that much of what I say is common sense anyway. My coverage of the extensive literature on critical theory is admittedly extremely selective. A lot of the technical information contained here is already available, expressed in conventionally condensed form, in the scholarly literature, especially in

the invaluable edition by Claus Wilcke, *Das Lugalbandaepos*, to which my indebtedness will be apparent on every page. I realise that it is not fair to hold its author to every view expressed in 1969. I have in many places avoided giving the usual battery of references to philological discussions of words, since these may found, by those who wish to follow them up, in Wilcke and in other works mentioned.

In the interest of readability, I have chosen mostly to avoid using '?' and other typographical marks of uncertainty in the translations. But it cannot be stressed too much how provisional some of these translations are. Many will be improved upon, in time. This should emphatically not prevent a broad range of readers from at least making an attempt to appreciate this unexplored literature.

Sumerian and Akkadian, when 'transliterated' into roman script from the cuneiform script in which they were written, are conventionally printed as a series of words or syllables (each representing one cuneiform sign) joined by hyphens to make longer words or grammatical complexes. Homophonous signs are distinguished by diacritic accents or subscript numerals. 'Determinative' signs are printed in small superscript type. Where citations from literary works are given they are presented in this diplomatic form. However, where individual Sumerian words are quoted in the body of the English text, they are usually (except in very technical contexts) 'transcribed' into conventional words and printed in italic (contrary to the usual practice according to which italic is reserved for Akkadian). These are reconstructed pronunciations only, intended to make the reading of the text easier.¹ The symbol š represents 'sh', and ḡ stands for the English 'ng' sound.

Footnote references to standard Assyriological works follow the usage of the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* or R. Borger, *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur*.

In recent years, while working on this book, I have been very much stimulated by the meetings of the Mesopotamian Literature Group at Groningen University, two of which I was able to contribute to, and I am grateful to its organisers (Herman Vanstiphout and Marianne Vogelzang) and its participants for the encouragement they have provided. Indebtedness to other colleagues will be evident from the frequency with which they are cited in the text and notes. Herman Vanstiphout kindly sent me two of his articles currently in press. John Baines, Piotr Michalowski and Herman Vanstiphout took the trouble to read the whole text and to make many useful suggestions. Through the kindness of Marc Van De Mierop and Steve Tinney I was able to present some of the ideas

¹ For a clear account of the workings of cuneiform script, see C.B.F. Walker, *Cuneiform*.

proposed here in seminars at Columbia and Philadelphia in 1996. I should like to express my thanks, too, for the hospitality both of Michael Hunter and of Sylvia Marshall, in whose homes important parts of the manuscript were written.

This page intentionally left blank

Glossary of ancient Mesopotamian proper names

- Akkad*: the region to the north of Sumer
Ama-ušumgal-ana: an alternative name for Dumuzi
An: the god of the heavens, a supreme deity
Anshan: a region of the Zagros mountains
Anuna: the great gods, sometimes associated with the mountains
Anzu: a monstrous mythological bird
Aratta: a legendary city of highland Iran
Dumuzi: a shepherd god, the lover of Inana
Enki: the god of the subterranean waters
Enlil: one of the most senior deities
Enmerkar: a hero, ruler of Unug; son of Utu
Eridu: a city in southern Sumer, principal cult place of Enki
Inana: the goddess of love and war, tutelary goddess of both Unug and Aratta; daughter of Suen
Iškur: the god of storms
Kulaba: part of the city of Unug; used as an alternative name for Unug
Lugalbanda: a hero of Unug
Lullubu mountains: a region in the Zagros mountains
Mardu: a nomadic people (the so-called ‘Amorites’)
Nanna: the moon god, son of Enlil
Ningal: a goddess, mother of Utu
Ninguena: an alternative name for Ninkasi
Ninhursaĝa: a mother goddess
Ninkasi: the beer goddess
Ninlil: a goddess, wife of Enlil
Nintu: an alternative name for Ninhursaĝa
Ninurta: a warrior god, son of Enlil
Nirah: a snake deity
Suen: an alternative name of Nanna
Sumer: the southernmost region of Mesopotamia
Šakkan: a god of wild animals
Šara: a warrior god, son of Inana
Unug: a city in southern Sumer
Uraš: a mother goddess, also called the Wild Cow

Utu: the sun god

Zabu mountains: a region of the Zagros mountains

Zangara: a god of dreams

Zubi mountains: a region of the Zagros mountains

PART ONE

This page intentionally left blank

1

Introductory

1.1 READING THE OLDEST POETRY

On, and beneath, the surface of modern Iraq are the remains of the successive cultures of ancient Mesopotamia. The Assyrians and the Babylonians were the inheritors of an even more ancient civilisation, Sumer, whose origins can be traced back into the fourth millennium BC, if not earlier. Sumer was the first literate culture in the history of the world, and it used cuneiform writing for as wide a range of purposes as writing is used for today, including the diffusion of literature.

The entire tradition of cuneiform writing can be counted as nearly three and a quarter millennia all told, from the earliest preserved documents (before 3100 BC) to the latest dated (first century AD), and within these ranges the written poetic literature of ancient Mesopotamia spans about two thousand years (2500–500 BC). These are approximate dates, but they give some notion of the immense span of the coherent, self-referent tradition. Assyrian scribes of the seventh century BC studied the palaeography of two thousand years earlier. Babylonian scholars of the first century BC made critical editions of Sumerian religious songs originally composed in the twenty-first century BC. But while indubitably a rich stream of survivals flowed on into ancient Greek, Indian and Arabic civilisation, mediated by translations into other languages and by oral transmission, nevertheless the ability to understand cuneiform writing itself was lost for nearly two millennia until its rediscovery and decipherment in the nineteenth century AD.²

Crucially, then, there is no living tradition of reading the literature of ancient Mesopotamia in modern times as there has been of ancient Greek literature since the Renaissance, of Latin since at least the early Middle Ages and, unbroken, of the Bible since its original compilation. A few Mesopotamian works, over the last hundred years, have eased their way into the periphery, at least, of the reading public's awareness. On 3rd December 1872 at a meeting in London of the Society for Biblical

² For a comprehensive assessment of the survival of Mesopotamian traditions, see now S.M. Dalley, ed., *The legacy of Mesopotamia*; for the influences on Greek literature, see M.L. West, *The east face of Helicon. West Asiatic influences on Greek poetry and myth*.

Archaeology, George Smith lectured on his discovery of part of the epic of Gilgamesh to a large and distinguished audience including W.E. Gladstone, the Prime Minister, and so enthralled his hearers that a national newspaper, *The Daily Telegraph*, undertook to fund his continuing research. For schoolboys of my own generation, Nancy Sandars' Penguin Classics version of this Babylonian work (put together from English, French and German translations) was available, memorable for its pink cover (in an early printing of 1960) and arresting English phrases which created a horizon of expectations long before I could read the Akkadian words.³ It has now sold more than a million copies, and is still in print. On the other hand, the poetic literature of ancient Sumer – the oldest human literature known to us – seems almost wholly unfamiliar to a wider public, and such as is available in English translation is mainly due to the labours of Sam Kramer⁴ and Thorkild Jacobsen;⁵ yet undoubtedly these poems 'have a right to a place in the world's literature'.⁶

However, this book is not about the popularity today of Mesopotamian, or particularly of Sumerian, literature (or at least only in the most oblique way), but about how we read it, and indeed whether we can read it. Perhaps it would be fairer to punctuate that as: how we 'read' it, and indeed whether we can 'read' it. 'Reading' Sumerian literature – any foreign literature – is a rich exploration, not a simple question of translation. In choosing to write particularly about literary imagery, my intention has been to focus on an aspect of Sumerian literature which rings strangely in the ears of a modern reader, and continues to ring strangely even when one becomes reasonably familiar with what is known of the literary, historical and material culture of the people who produced it. Yet not only is metaphorical language fundamental to literary diction but, in a broader sense, metaphor is endemic to all language. I have fixed

³ N. K. Sandars, *The epic of Gilgamesh*.

⁴ *Sumerian mythology* (1944, rev. 1961); *From the tablets of Sumer* (1956), revised as *L'histoire commence à Sumer* (1957, rev. 1975; English edition 1959, rev. 1981); *The Sumerians* (1963).

⁵ *The harps that once...* *Sumerian poetry in translation* (1987).

⁶ N.K. Sandars, *The epic of Gilgamesh*, p. 7, where she is specifically referring to the Gilgamesh poems in Sumerian as well as those in Akkadian. Most of the poetry discussed in the present volume was probably not composed before c. 2168 BC, and is therefore roughly contemporary with the metrically organised ancient Egyptian literature of the Middle Kingdom (mostly 12th Dynasty, from c. 2000 BC). But while the few pieces of Egyptian Old Kingdom literature (4th–8th Dynasties, 2575–2134 BC) are as ancient as Mesopotamian works in Old Sumerian (dating from 2500 BC or earlier), they are narrowly functional, while in Sumer by this date the written tradition of narrative poetry was already well established.

In addition to Jacobsen's volume, a limited range of Sumerian poetry in modern translations can also be found in W.W. Hallo, ed., *The context of scripture, I: canonical compositions from the Biblical world* (in English); J. Bottéro and S.N. Kramer, *Lorsque les dieux faisaient l'homme* (in French); and W.H.Ph. Römer and D.O. Edzard, *Mythen und Epen I* (in German). The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature, including English translations, is in progress at <http://www-etcsl.orient.ox.ac.uk/>.

on the topic of imagery, then, as a test case for investigation, and the aim of this essay will be to see if it is possible by extended reflection to create a coherence for certain written literature which is, chronologically at least, the most alien imaginable to us, and which therefore might seem the most inaccessible and least rewarding to approach: a special case of difficult beauty. I have chosen to base this study on one work, the engaging poem *Lugalbanda*, a narrative of the hero of that name and his encounter with a monstrous bird, the ancestor of the mythical roc in the narrative of Sindbad in the *Thousand nights and a night*.⁷

Despite the many questions which arise, it actually does not seem necessary for present purposes to devote much space to an appropriate definition of literature.⁸ By contrast, that has been a rather crucial question for Egyptologists to answer.⁹ With very few exceptions, Sumerian literature is composed in poetic form, and Sumerian poetry can very broadly speaking be defined in extrinsic terms as a heightened form of language written in lines of verse.¹⁰ (The lines are laid out on the clay tablet exactly as in modern European poetry: left-justified, with the continuation of an exceptionally long line indented to show that it is not the beginning of a new line.)¹¹ In other words, we can accept an implicit ancient definition, of a purely formal nature. Individual Sumerian compositions (with the

⁷ The Arabic name of the bird is *ruhḥ* (also the origin of the rook in the game of chess); the tradition of the roc was first known in Europe from the account in the *Travels* of Marco Polo (book 3, chapter 36). The Anzu is a mythical bird but appears to be strongly reminiscent of a type of eagle; see 4.2.10 below.

⁸ This is not to deny the existence of such problems, which are possibly greater for the 'literature' in Akkadian; see M.E. Vogelzang and H.L.J. Vanstiphout, eds, *Mesopotamian poetic language: Sumerian and Akkadian*, and the recent discussion by A.J. Ferrara in 'Topoi and stock-strophes in Sumerian literary tradition: some observations, part I', in *JNES* 54 (1995), especially pp. 85ff.

⁹ 'Egyptian literature can be defined as a body of written high culture with purposes other than the merely necessary communication of practical information. Within this literature there was a significant body of texts which were more concerned with aesthetically structured form and were consistently composed in verse: religious, funerary and monumental texts. There was also a smaller group of texts in which aesthetic considerations were primary. This latter group corresponds to the popular modern idea of things "literary" . . .', writes R.B. Parkinson in *Voices from ancient Egypt*, pp. 16f. He explains that (according to Gerhard Fecht's theory of 'metre', p. 20) a broader range of texts in Egyptian was metrical or in verse, and so this makes more acute the problem of where 'literature' begins and ends. Egyptian texts can be 'metricised' (on the basis of stress) independently of their structure or purpose.

¹⁰ See the complex discussion, especially on the distinction between lines and verses, by H.L.J. Vanstiphout, "'Verse language" in Standard Sumerian literature', in J.C. de Moor and W.G.E. Watson, eds, *Verses in ancient Near Eastern prose*, pp. 305–29; also the remarks of William Bright cited by P. Michalowski in M.E. Vogelzang and H.L.J. Vanstiphout, eds, *Mesopotamian poetic language: Sumerian and Akkadian*, p. 142.

¹¹ A variety of specialised formats are employed in some literary manuscripts, see for instance S.J. Tinney's remarks on the various species of so-called *Kurzzeilen* layout, in 'On the poetry for King Išme-Dagan', in *OLZ* 90 (1995), cols. 9–14. Different manuscripts sometimes divide the lines of a composition differently: one may run together what are two lines in another manuscript. This has a bearing on strophic studies.

exception of one composite genre, the *balaḡ*)¹² rarely extend to more than 750 lines. Over the last hundred years a great deal of labour has been expended on the physical recovery of ancient Near Eastern literatures, their reconstitution from the fragmentary remains to which the ravages of time have reduced the clay tablets on which they were written, not to mention the activities of

Fate, Chance, kings and desperate men,

and on the gradual elucidation of the now extinct languages in which they were composed. Archaeological recovery can never be complete, nor will the re-creation of Sumerian literature. Even allowing for the large amounts of fragmentary clay tablet manuscripts already excavated and awaiting study in the world's museums, the very idea of a 'complete' ancient literature is a chimera. This has as much to do with the socially restricted use of writing in ancient Mesopotamia as a means of recording literature much of which may have been composed and performed orally and to a large degree transmitted by oral tradition, in multiple versions, as it has with the available resources of scholarly endeavour and manpower in modern times. Nonetheless it is understandable that until relatively recently most effort has been expended on basic reconstruction and literal explication of literary works, and the need for this labour will continue indefinitely.

Assyriology, as a scholarly activity, has remained (or perhaps even become) a somewhat isolated and esoteric discipline. It has a history firmly grounded in the Orientalist tradition. Insofar as Orientalism (I use the term to refer more to the field of study than to the cultural perversion)¹³ had or has rules of operation, it has tended towards the style of scholarship which may loosely be called positivist: the view, in its extreme form, that any knowledge not entirely based on factual, historical and extrinsic evidence can be dismissed as fruitless speculation. In the study of literature this approach was explicitly challenged by the Formalists, by the Prague School theorists and, independently, in the United States and Great Britain by New Criticism, from the 1920s onwards, and by any number of more recent critical approaches, but it still remains a fundamental and lively tradition in much Near Eastern scholarship. The positivist approach has meant a concentration on the genesis of the text, the social and historical *Sitz im Leben* of the composition, the recovery of the intentions of the author (where appropriate) and the use of linguistic history to invest the

¹² See my 'Eme-sal cult songs and prayers', in P. Michalowski et al., eds, *Velles paraules*, pp. 23–36.

¹³ As exposed by Edward Said in *Orientalism* (New York, 1978).

words of the text with meaning. In other words, it treats 'literary texts' exactly as any other form of historical 'text', discarding as too subjective and unscientific any attempt to account for precisely those distinctive qualities that make literature 'literary': the meaning and effect of the experience of reading. The result has been that literary works have been trawled for evidence of social conditions or historical facts, as sources for the history of thought or religion, or for the history of literature itself: the history of genres, the tracing of influences and the development of traditions. To some extent this pattern of development reflects the general and justifiable search to reconstruct the Mesopotamian world in as much detail as possible.

An outline history of the development of Sumerian literature was sketched nearly fifty years ago in 1951 by Adam Falkenstein, and has been modified only in detail since then.¹⁴ Notwithstanding numerous lacunae, many of which will never be filled, a picture has gradually emerged of what may be called a corpus of Sumerian literature. This body of works can be thought of as classical and coherent, so long as the earliest and latest parts of the tradition are omitted: that is, works in Old Sumerian written in the Early Dynastic Period (before c. 2400 BC, when the imprecision of the writing system seriously hampers modern understanding of anything but the general drift of the contents), and later works which entered the tradition of Babylonian literature after the Old Babylonian Period (after c. 1650 BC) and were almost always preserved with an interlinear translation into Akkadian, as well as works composed in a barbarous artificial form of the language after it was dead.

The central, classical 'corpus' (dating from roughly 2150 to 1650 BC) is then available for interpretative assessment, and in recent years there has been a gradual movement towards literary appreciation of these works. When for all but the most specialised readers it is necessary to present works in translation, and where those translations are still for the most part halting and obscure, and must be accompanied by explanatory notes, the commonest recourse has inevitably been to synopsis of the superficial content. However, several attempts have been made at literary analysis of individual Sumerian works, paralleled by similar studies of Akkadian literature.

¹⁴ 'Zur Chronologie der sumerischen Literatur', in *CRRAI* 2 (Paris, 1951), pp. 12–30. See more recently W.W. Hallo, 'Toward a history of Sumerian literature', in *AS* 20 (1976), pp. 181–203; D.O. Edzard, 'Literatur', §3 'Überblick über die sumerische Literatur', in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 7 (1987), pp. 35–41; J. Krecher, 'Sumerische Literatur', in W. Röllig, ed., *Altorientalische Literaturen*, Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, I (Wiesbaden, 1978), pp. 101–50; articles (all beginning 'Sumerische . . .') by Edzard and C. Wilcke in *Kindlers Neues Literaturlexikon*, volume 19, pp. 574–606 (Munich, 1992). A succinct bibliographical note can be found in H.L.J. Vanstiphout, 'The matter of Aratta: an overview', in *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 26 (1995), p. 5, n. 2.

1.2 LITERARY STUDY OF MESOPOTAMIAN LITERATURE

Such studies have proceeded, very broadly speaking, along two different paths, and here it is convenient to refer to studies of Akkadian works as well as Sumerian.¹⁵ First, there has been an interest in looking at technical features and arrangement on a small scale. This includes parallelism of word patterning within the individual line of verse or between pairs of lines; grouping of lines into pairs, or groups of three or four on the basis of meaning, structure or sound; assonance and alliteration; and rhyme. Although neither Sumerian nor Akkadian verse is based on rhyme, it can be shown that comparable effects were sometimes exploited. The principal attraction of such an approach is probably that it appears to yield palpable results.¹⁶

The second style of criticism has been analysis of structure on a much larger scale, especially of the longer narrative poems. This may in some cases owe something to structuralist literary theory, which would tend to break up the narrative sequence and concentrate on 'logical relations'.¹⁷

¹⁵ P. Michalowski, in 'Carminative magic: towards an understanding of Sumerian poetics', *ZA* 71 (1981), pp. 1–18, also traces two paths of development, roughly comparable but not identical to those indicated here. Some studies lie between, or harmonise, the two approaches, such as Herman Vanstiphout's 'Towards a reading of "Gilgamesh and Agga"' or Bendt Alster's 'On the interpretation of the Sumerian myth "Inanna and Enki"'

¹⁶ Among recent examples of these are the studies by N.C. Veldhuis, 'The heart grass and related matters', in *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 21 (1990), pp. 27–44, and *A cow of Šin*. The interesting study by A.J. Ferrara, 'Topoi and stock-strophes in Sumerian literary tradition: some observations, part I', in *JNES* 54 (1995), pp. 81–117, which issues from his earlier work on *Nanna-Suen's journey to Nippur*, is a study of the 'topos of plenitude' and the stock-strophe of 'abundance' (defined *ibid.* p. 84). Set in the context of a discussion informed by abundant reference to current critical argument, it is principally concerned with formal aspects, and secondarily with broader structure and historical development.

¹⁷ This would work rather well with a poem such as *Enlil and Sud*, where there is little narrative and the relations are everything; or *Lugalbanda in the mountain cave*, which is full of structural oppositions (sickness / recovery; lack of fire / flints for lighting; capture of game animals / difficulty in using weapons etc.). Michalowski, in 'Carminative magic: towards an understanding of Sumerian poetics', in *ZA* 71 (1981), pp. 1–18, attributes interest in structural units and patterns rather to a desire to demonstrate the oral origins of Sumerian poetry. He has in mind specifically the work of B. Alster on *Dumuzi's dream* and *Ninurta and the turtle*, although Alster, in his article 'On the interpretation of the Sumerian myth "Inanna and Enki"', allies himself to the approach of Lévi-Strauss. The interesting analysis by H. Limet, 'Les fantaisies du dieu Enki: essai sur les techniques de la narration dans les mythes', in H. Behrens, D. Loding and M.T. Roth, eds, *DUMU-E₂-DUB-BA-A: studies in honor of Åke W. Sjöberg*, pp. 357–65, takes as its inspiration the structuralist narrative theory of Gérard Genette. The investigation by O.R. Gurney, 'The tale of the poor man of Nippur and its folktale parallels', in *Anatolian studies* 22 (1972), pp. 149–58, pursues an approach which has its ultimate origins closer to Formalism, while the recent study by Edzard of the narratives of *Gilgamesh and Huwawa*, *Lugalbanda* and *Gilgamesh*, *Enkidu and the nether world* draws explicitly on the work of Propp, Antti Aarne and Stith Thompson (see 'Sumerian epic: epic or fairytale?', in *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 27 (May 1994), pp. 7–14).

However, it is more likely to originate in the dividing up of summary synopses into convenient 'sections' which are in no way explicit in the text. Different critics may divide the same text in different ways, or revise their analysis,¹⁸ reminding us that this attempt to invest literary works with meaningful shape, however obvious the shifts and pauses in the narrative flow may seem, must be seen as an act of criticism too, rather than of disengaged description.

In both cases the recourse to formal objects of investigation may also owe something to the absence of ancient literary criteria.

1.3 METAPHORICAL LANGUAGE

There is every reason to be encouraged by the various literary approaches evidenced in the last few years. Yet one aspect which might be considered crucial for the very literariness of literature, metaphorical language, has so far received very little attention. The richness of metaphor is a principal distinguishing feature between the high style and the prosaic, and a principal aim of this study will be to direct attention to this richness by investigating the working of metaphorical language in one Sumerian poem, *Lugalbanda*.

In a presidential address delivered to the American Oriental Society on 20th March 1968, Sam Kramer evidently envisaged that Sumerian metaphorical language would form an interesting area of study, although his catalogue of examples, organised according to their subject matter, was modestly described as 'limited in scope and tentative in character' and intended as 'a faint, faltering harbinger of better things to come'. These 'Sumerian similes'¹⁹ at least gave some idea of the range of subject matter and sources of such imagery, although they were not accompanied by any analysis. At any rate it is clear that Kramer, whose life's work was devoted to the patient piecing together of the fragments of Sumerian literature, recognised the special role of metaphorical language or imagery, the exact terminology for which can be discussed later.

This special role can be accounted for on two levels. First, in general, imagery is a vivifying force in all literary works of all cultures. Claus Wilcke²⁰ was content to cite the view of the literary historian W. Kayser that metaphorical language (*Bildersprache*) is 'die dichterischste Figur des

¹⁸ For instance Wilcke made a small change to his episodic analysis of *Lugalbanda* in *RIA* 7, p. 129, from that in *Das Lugalbandaepos*, p. 11.

¹⁹ *JAOS* 89 (1969), pp. 1–10 (credit for collecting which he claimed was largely due to his student Barry Eichler, pp. 2f.).

²⁰ *AS* 20 (1974), pp. 210–12.